

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,542	10/30/2003	Toru Tanada	FUJX 20.712	7563
26304 7590 08/07/2007 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP			EXAMINER	
575 MADISON	N AVENUE		AGA, SORI A	
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•	•	2609	
		•		-
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		08/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/697,542	TANADA, TORU			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Sori A. Aga	2609			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE INSTITUTE TO THE MAILING DATE IN THE MAILING D	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATE (a). In no event, however, may a reply rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANE	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Oct	ctober 2003.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	<del>/</del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.					
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 October 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
			•			
Attachmen	t(s)	•	•			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mary (PTO-413) ail Date			
3) 🔯 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  rr No(s)/Mail Date 10/30/2003 & 07/18/2007.	_	nal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/697,542 Page 2

Art Unit: 2609

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claim1,5,6,8,9,11,13 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Akahane et al. (US 20010050914 A1) (herein after Akahane).

Regarding claim 1: Akahane teaches interfacing device comprising an interfacing section with links having a CAM for accommodating a VPN capable of routing relating to a VPN according to information stored in the CAM. Akahane teaches, "...VPN identification is performed by ...logical channels (links) multiplexed and terminated to a physical interface..." (Paragraph 0016 lines 2-3)

Regarding a communication processing section for performing routing or filtering relating to the VPN according to information that is stored in a CAM; Akahane teaches "...edge router (communication processing section) searches the routing table (information stored in CAM) for the ...VPN, determines the forwarded-to-destination of the packet across the ISP network... can forward (route) the packets to their correct destinations without mistaking one for another. ...". The routing table is considered to be the same as Akahane's routing table because Akahane teaches that the logical table can be structured using CAM. (Paragraph 0072).

Akahane also teaches a plurality of interfacing sections each in separate memories (CAM) (Paragraph 007 lines 6-9 and Paragraph 0066 lines 4-6).

Akahane also teaches a VPN Identification table (storage section) for registering therein in advance a combination of identifiers of interfacing sections accommodating the VPNs therein individually. Figure 7A and 7B show examples of such a table. VPN ID can be a physical interface number (interfacing section) as shown in fig. 7B. Fig. 7A/B also show physical interface numbers are mapped to corresponding VPNs individually.

The routing table is considered to be the same as Akahane's routing table because Akahane teaches that the logical table can be structured using CAM. (Paragraph 0072).

Claim 5: All the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 5. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above regarding claim 1. Regarding the switching section for delivering a packet among the plurality of interfacing sections, Akahane teaches a switch (51) that is capable of receiving packets via input lines (physical interfaces) and through lower layer and packet layer processors. Packets can be input and outputted through the designated output route numbers (fig.4 and paragraph 0068).

Claim 6: All the limitations of claim 5 are included in claim 6. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above regarding claim 5. Regarding the plurality of interfacing sections and the switching section interfacing with different autonomous systems in data link or transport layer, Akahane teaches each LAN (autonomous system) is interfaced with the router as shown in figs 1 and 3. Akahane also teaches "...VPN edge router ...by using the identifiers of logical channels multiplexed and terminated to a

physical interface. As the logical channel identifiers, information for lower layer protocols below IP is used..." (paragraph 0012 lines 1-5). A person having ordinary skill in the art would know data link layer is lower layer protocol than IP (i.e. Network layer) in both the OSI and TCP/IP models.

Regarding the different autonomous systems being intervenient in all or part of the VPNs, figures 1,2 and 3 show plural VPNs (autonomous systems) found within VPNA and VPNB.

Claim 8: All the limitations of claim 5 are included in claim8 Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 5. Regarding the switching section delivering all of the routing information between the controlling section and the plurality of interfacing sections; Akahane teaches a switch (switching section) that receives packets and distributes among interfaces and processors as described regarding claim 5. Since the routing information is included in the headers of the packet (as discussed regarding claim 13), the switching section delivers the routing information together with the packets.

<u>Claim 9</u>: All the limitations of claim 6 are included in claim 9. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 6 as discussed above. The limitation included in claim 9 is the same as the limitations in claim 8. Akahane teaches the limitations of claim 8 as discussed above.

<u>Claim 11</u>: All the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 1. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above. Regarding the controlling section delivering routing information to the plurality of interfacing sections via a communication link;

Akahane teaches a Akahane teaches a switch (switching section) that receives packets

Application/Control Number: 10/697,542

Art Unit: 2609

including routing information and distributes among interfaces and processors as described regarding claim 5. A person having ordinary skill in the art would consider the switching section as a communication link since information is sent and received across the switch.

Regarding claim 13: where a network-interfacing device comprising an interfacing section interfacing with a link accommodating a VPN; Akahane teaches, "...VPN identification is performed by ...logical channels (links) multiplexed and terminated to a physical interface..." (Paragraph 0016 lines 2-3)

Regarding a communication processing section for performing routing or filtering relating to the VPN according to information that is stored in a CAM; Akahane teaches "...edge router (communication processing section) searches the routing table (information stored in CAM) for the ...VPN, determines the forwarded-to-destination of the packet across the ISP network... can forward (route) the packets to their correct destinations without mistaking one for another. ...". The routing table is considered to be the same as Akahane's routing table because Akahane teaches that the logical table can be structured using CAM. (Paragraph 0072).

Regarding the controlling section for writing routing information to the CAM, Akahane teaches "...routing table for VPN contains the entries of destination IP address..." (paragraph 0066 lines 7-8). Akahane further teaches that IP packet information can be extracted from received IP packet headers (Paragraph 0057 lines 10-11). Therefore Akahane teaches that routing information (IP address) is written to the CAM (table). And

since destination IP addresses are included in said routing tables (paragraph 0038 line 7), this information (destination address) is delivered from an exterior.

Claim 17: All the limitations of claim 13 are included in claim 17. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 13 as discussed above. Regarding the routing information being received via a port connected to the communication processing section, Akahane teaches "...packets are received across the line (55) to the lower layer processor (53) and forwarded across the line (56) from the lower layer processor (54)...." (Paragraph 0056). Akahane refers to the input lines as having points at which they connect to the router. Therefore, the input lines along with the lower layer processors are considered to be the same as ports since packet are received via the input lines from outside the router.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 2,3,14 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahane as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Siegel et al. (US 6266336 B1) (herein after Siegel).

<u>Claims 2 and 3</u>: All the limitations of claim 1 are included in claims 2 and 3. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claims 2 and 3. However Akahane does not explicitly teach a

controlling section that omits requesting for writing overlapping pieces of routing information and interfacing sections that maintain uniqueness of each piece of routing information. However Siegel in the same field of endeavor (packet switching) teaches that an exit block (controlling section) prevents duplicate entries from entering the table (Column 8 line 18). Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to avoid duplicate entries in a routing table (both as a result of request by the controlling section and by the interfacing sections maintaining uniqueness) in order to shorten the length of entries that will have to be searched and also efficiently use memory. Claim 14: All the limitations of claim 13 are included in claim 14. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 13 as discussed above. However Akahane does not explicitly teach the controlling section maintains uniqueness of the information stored in the CAM. However Siegel in the same field of endeavor (packet switching) teaches that an exit block (controlling section) prevents duplicate entries from entering the table (Column 8 line 18). Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to avoid duplicate entries in a routing table in order to shorten the length of entries that will have to be searched and also efficiently use memory.

Claim 18: All the limitations of claim 14 are included in claim 18. The references teach all the limitations of claim 14 as discussed above regarding claim 14. Regarding the routing information being received via a port connected to the communication processing section, Akahane teaches "...packets are received across the line (55) to the lower layer processor (53) and forwarded across the line (56) from the lower layer processor (54)...." (paragraph 0056). Akahane refers to the input lines as having points at which they

connect to the router. Therefore, the input lines along with the lower layer processors are considered to be the same as ports since packet are received via the input lines from outside the router.

3. Claim 4 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahane et al. (US 20010050914 A1) (herein after Akahane) in view of Sugai et al. (US 6683885 B1) (herein after Sugai)

Claim 4: Akahane teaches interfacing devices comprising interfacing sections with links having a CAM for accommodating VPNs capable of routing relating to a VPN according to information stored in the CAMs. (Paragraph 0016 lines 2-3, Paragraph 007 lines 6-9 and Paragraph 0066 lines 4-6)

It is inherent that Akahane's router to have a means for delivering routing information to the interfacing sections and writing said information to the CAMs (tables); Akahane does not specify a controlling section for delivering and interfacing sections for writing routing information to their respective CAMs said information being of the delivered routing information. However, Sugai in the same field of endeavor (network apparatus) teaches a routing manager (controlling section) distributes routing information to each routing processor (interfacing sections). (Column 5 lines 2-4).

Sugai also teaches "...routing processor (interfacing sections) stores (writes) ...the header information (routing information) on the input packets in a header memory

Application/Control Number: 10/697,542

Art Unit: 2609

Page 9

(CAMs); wherein the header memory is accessed to search for the destination of the input packets stored in the packet buffer based on the stored header information..."

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to add a controlling section for delivering routing information to the interfacing sections and enable the packet processing card (interfacing section) write routing information to the CAMs (routing tables) in order to execute high-speed operation of route search by use of a high-speed

<u>Claim 12</u>: All the limitations of claim 4 are included in claim 12. The references teach all the limitations of claim 4. Akahane further teaches routing information is delivered via a communication link as discussed regarding claim 11.

memory as some of the parts into which the storage unit is divided.

4. Claim 7 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahane as applied to claim 1 above in view of Bonomi et al (US 2002/0105952 A1). (herein after Bonomi).

Claim 7: all the limitations of claim 5 are included in claim 7. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 5. However, Akahane does not explicitly teach the function of the controlling section is distributed to ports. However, Bonomi, in the same field of endeavor (Network switch) teaches that central functions of the switch (as shown in figure 4) can be more distributed or centralized as needed in order to adopt to various available technologies, price/performance goals etc.

<u>Claim 10</u>: All the limitations of claim 7 are included in claim 10. The references teach all the limitations of claim 7 as discussed above. The limitation included in claim 10 is the

same as the limitations in claim 8. Akahane teaches the limitations of claim 8 as discussed regarding claim 8.

5. Claim15 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahane as applied to claim 13 above in view of Yim (US 2002/0052972 A1) (herein after Yim).

Claims 15: All the limitations of claim 13 are included in claim 15. Akahane teaches all the limitations of claim 13 as discussed above regarding claim 13. However, Akahane does not explicitly teach a controlling section for requesting the exterior to supply routing information when a predetermined event has occurred. However, Yim in the same field of endeavor (switch/router) teaches that a switching router broadcasts an ARP request in to an external VLAN (VLAN 300) in order to learn the address of the destination host (host 301). Yim teaches that the request is generated by the second router 200 to the second VLAN 300 (VLAN 300 is an external VLAN because the host101 and router 200 belong to VLAN100) (Paragraph 0042 lines 8-18). Yim further teaches that the ARP request is generated as a result of host 101 sending a request to the internal router 200 (paragraph 0042 lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention request the exterior (VLAN 300) to supply routing information when a predetermined event has occurred (when a host inside the VLAN wants to connect with a host in VLAN 300 and transmits a request to the switch).

Claim 19: All the limitations of claim 15 are included in claim 19. The references teach all the limitations of claim 15 as discussed above regarding claim 15. Regarding the routing information being received via a port connected to the communication processing

section, Akahane teaches "...packets are received across the line (55) to the lower layer processor (53) and forwarded across the line (56) from the lower layer processor (54)...." (paragraph 0056). Akahane refers to the input lines as having points at which they connect to the router. Therefore, the input lines along with the lower layer processors are considered to be the same as ports since packet are received via the input lines from outside the router.

6. Claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahane and Siegel as applied to claim14 above, and further in view of Yim (US 2002/0052972 A1) (herein after Yim).

Claim 16: All the limitations of claim 14 are included in claim 16. The references teach all the limitations of claim 14 as discussed above regarding claim 16. However, Akahane does not explicitly teach a controlling section for requesting the exterior to supply routing information when a predetermined event has occurred. However, Yim in the same field of endeavor (switch/router) teaches that a switching router broadcasts an ARP request in to an external VLAN (VLAN 300) in order to learn the address of the destination host (host 301). Yim teaches that the request is generated by the second router 200 to the second VLAN 300 (VLAN 300 is an external VLAN because the host101 and router 200 belong to VLAN100) (Paragraph 0042 lines 8-18). Yim further teaches that the ARP request is generated as a result of host 101 sending a request to the internal router 200 (paragraph 0042 lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention request the exterior (VLAN 300) to supply routing information when a

predetermined event has occurred (when a host inside the VLAN wants to connect with a host in VLAN 300 and transmits a request to the switch).

Page 12

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sori A. Aga whose telephone number is (571) 270-1868. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00, F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Garber can be reached on (571) 270-1868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yuwen Pan

S.A.